



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,602	06/22/2001	Frederic Bauchot	FR920000050US1	7284

26681 7590 03/21/2008
Driggs, Hogg, Daugherty & Del Zoppo Co., L.P.A.
38500 CHARDON ROAD
DEPT. IEN
WILLOUGHBY HILLS, OH 44094

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/21/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/887,602	BAUCHOT, FREDERIC	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/22/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-17 and 20 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 19, 21, 22 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 12/21/2007.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-12 have been canceled. Claims 13-25 have been added, and are pending in the case. Claims 13, and 23 are independent claims.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on application # 480096.7 filed with the EPO on 10/24/2000, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 6/22/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The IDS filed on 2/22/08 has been considered by the Examiner.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 18-19, and 21-22 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 18 depends on itself. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al, hereinafter Anderson (Pat.# 5,463,724, 10/31/1995), in view of Barnes, “10 Minute Guide to Windows 3.1”, Alpha, 1992, pp.60-64, and further in view of “Getting Results with Microsoft Office 97”, hereinafter Office, Microsoft Press, 1997, pp.169-181.

Regarding independent claim 23, Anderson discloses the grouping of cells in a page of a multidimensional spreadsheet—*defining a set ranges of cells*—for changing the information or content of the different groupings of cells simultaneously. Information is placed in one group of cells, and then this information is automatically percolated or replicated to the other group of cells in the page. The cells have content, such as “Loan amount, %”, etc. The groups of cells have different addresses relative to the first cell (A1) of the respective page where the cell groups are found—*at least two of said ranges having different addresses relative to the top leftmost cell A1 of the respective page on which each of said ranges are located* (col.10, lines 58-col.11, line

30, and col.7, lines 62-col.8, line 10, fig. 4G-4J). Therefore, by changing the content in one cell of the group the content of the whole group is also changed.

Moreover, Anderson discloses the automatic percolating or replicating of information changes made in one block of cells in one page to a version of the same block of cells in other locations—*automatically performing a self-replication operation* (col.11, lines 4-30, fig. 4H-J). In other words, once the block of cells have been modified, this modification is passed to every cell in the other group—*automatically determining the set of ranges to which the changed range of cells belongs to, and identifying the ranges or pages of cells belonging to said set or grouping --a) detecting a PSRR content update; b) retrieving the address of the updated PSRR; and c) pasting the updated range of cells into the range of cells pointed by the PSRR address field of the current record of the self replication table.*

Moreover, Anderson fails to explicitly disclose: *automatically copying the changed range of cells onto a buffer, automatically determining the set of ranges to which the changed range of cells belongs to, automatically identifying the ranges or pages of cells belonging to said set or grouping, and automatically pasting the content of the buffer in each of the identified range of cells belonging to said set.* However, Barnes teaches the copying of information into a clipboard--buffer. This information is then pasted from the clipboard into a specified location (page 60, lines 14-20). Office discloses automatically updating or pasting spreadsheet cells to a destination Word document, whenever figures within an originating spreadsheet, such as those in an Excel spreadsheet, change (page 174). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Anderson, Barnes, and Office, to automatically copy, determining, identifying, and pasting the block of cells into the clipboard or

Art Unit: 2178

RAM, because Barnes teaches above the copying of information from an original location to a second location without disturbing the original information, which provides the benefit of saving the time, and speeding the process needed to manually input the same information several times.

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Anderson discloses the automatic percolating or replicating of information changes made in one block of cells in one page to a version of the same block of cells in other locations—*including the utilization of a common repository to record data required to create, delete or rename a PSRS, to add a PSRR to a PSRS, or to suppress a PSRR from a PSRS* (col.11, lines 4-30, fig. 4H-J).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 25 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Claims 13-17, 20 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's indicated that the newly introduced claims overcome the prior art of record (page 8). The Applicant is directed towards the new grounds of rejection above, based upon the newly added claims.

Conclusion

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

Application/Control Number: 09/887,602
Art Unit: 2178

Page 7

/CESAR B PAULA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
--

3/28/2008